

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 MARYANN WATKINS, *et al.*,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.  
14

15 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
16 HOUSING AND COMMUNITY  
DEVELOPMENT, *et al.*,

17  
18 Defendants.  
19

Case No. 2:22-cv-07286-FLA (RAO)

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS,  
CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED  
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE,  
GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE, AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS  
MOOT [DKTS. 51, 61, 69]**  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the court has reviewed Plaintiffs’ Third Amended  
2 Complaint (“TAC”), Dkt. 46, Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the TAC, Dkt. No. 51,  
3 Plaintiffs’ Opposition, Dkt. 55, Defendants’ Reply, Dkt. No. 57, Plaintiffs’ Motion  
4 for Summary Judgment, Dkt. 61, Defendants’ Opposition, Dkt. No. 62, Plaintiffs’  
5 Reply, Dkt. 68, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge  
6 (“Report”) dated January 10, 2025, Dkt. 69, Plaintiffs’ Objections to the Report, Dkt.  
7 73, and all other records and files herein.

8 The court has engaged in a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report to  
9 which Plaintiffs have objected. The Report recommends the dismissal of Plaintiffs’  
10 Third Amended Complaint without further leave to amend. Dkt. 69. The Third  
11 Amended Complaint alleged violations of Plaintiffs’ civil rights based on  
12 Defendants’ delay of Plaintiffs’ plans to build a manufactured home in Los Angeles  
13 County. Dkt. 46 at 6, 8. Plaintiffs’ objections to the Report, Dkt. 73, do not  
14 warrant a change to the Report’s findings or recommendations.

15 Plaintiffs object to the Report’s finding that they have failed to state a claim  
16 on which relief may be granted. Dkt. 73 at 1–2. They object that Defendants held  
17 up the permit, refused to grant the permit, and could have performed the inspection  
18 or plan check under the standards of the Department of Housing and Urban  
19 Development. *Id.* These objections do not call into question the Report’s finding  
20 that such allegations do not raise a plausible basis for a claim under the First,  
21 Fourth, Eighth, Ninth, or Tenth Amendments. Dkt. 69 at 8. Plaintiffs also failed to  
22 state a Fifth Amendment claim for a regulatory taking, because they do not allege  
23 they were required to pay a fee or fund offsite work or improvements. *Id.* at 9–10.  
24 They also failed to state a Fourteenth Amendment claim for a violation of due  
25 process. *Id.* at 10–11.

26 Plaintiffs object to the Report’s finding that the claims against the California  
27 Department of Housing and Community Development and the official-capacity  
28 claims are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. Dkt. 73 at 3–6. The objections,

1 which are based on conclusory allegations of perjury, fraud, and bribery, raise no  
2 grounds to call into question the Report's Eleventh Amendment analysis. Dkt. 69  
3 at 6–7.

4 Finally, Plaintiffs object there has been judicial misconduct that resulted in a  
5 “fraud on the court.” Dkt. 73 at 7–15. Plaintiffs allege federal judges throughout  
6 the Ninth Circuit are being paid for their decisions. *Id.* at 7–8, 11. They also  
7 object, “God willing you will all be prosecuted for such hyenas’ crimes.” *Id.* at 11.  
8 These allegations are dismissed as frivolous and malicious. *See Theriault v. Silver*,  
9 574 F.2d 197, 197 (5th Cir. 1978) (order) (insulting and disrespectful references to  
10 the judge are subject to summary dismissal as beneath the dignity of the court).


11 The court is not persuaded by Plaintiffs’ objections and overrules them. The  
12 court hereby accepts and adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of  
13 the Magistrate Judge.

14 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 15 (1) Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss is granted;  
16 (2) Plaintiffs’ claims against Defendants are dismissed without prejudice; and  
17 (3) Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment is denied as moot.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20  
21 Dated: March 11, 2025

  
FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
United States District Judge